

# United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/955,434 09/10/2001		Peter Sauerbrei	49658-0512	1649		
7590 12/12/2006			EXAMINER			
Moser Patterson & Sheridan			BRIER, JEFFERY A			
3040 Post Oak I	Boulevard					
Suite 1500			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
Houston, TX 77056-6582			2628	2628		

DATE MAILED: 12/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/955,434	SAUERBREI, PETER
Examiner	Art Unit
Jeffery A. Brier	2628

		Јепегу А. Впег	2028			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress		
THE	REPLY FILED 27 November 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.			
	The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in the same of the same o	Appeal. To avoid aba fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)		
a)	The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.				
b)						
	TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70	06.07(f).				
have under set fo may r	nsions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exit of ToFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the sorth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) ICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as		
2.	The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th			
	NDMENTS					
3. 🔀	The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,			ecause		
	(a) They raise new issues that would require further co		TE below);			
	(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	• •	duaina ar aimmlifeina	tha issues for		
	(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for		
	(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rei	ected claims.			
	NOTE: <u>see page 2</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33					
4 🗆	The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324)		
5. 🗀				(		
6. <u> </u>			timely filed amendme	ent canceling the		
	non-allowable claim(s).	······································		ozozg ti.o		
7. 🗌	For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provide status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an e	explanation of		
	Claim(s) allowed:					
	Claim(s) objected to:					
	Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
4FFI	DAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
	The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu	t before or on the date of filing a N	otice of Appeal will no	t be entered		
	because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).					
9. 🗀	The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	overcome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fai	Is to provide a		
10. Г	☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	•		•		
	UEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		-			
11. 🏻	The request for reconsideration has been considered bu see page 2.	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:		
	☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)				
13. [	Other:					
			Jeffery A Brier Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2628			
			J.III. ZUZU			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Application/Control Number: 09/955,434

Art Unit: 2628

### Response to Amendment

Page 2

The amendment to claim 63 filed on 11/27/2006 raises new issues, however, the amendment to claim 63 does appear to overcome the 35 USC 112 first and 101 rejections of claim 63, however, the definition given by the specification for the term "displaying" will need to be determined to ensure that it is not undully broad.

2) The amendments to the preamble of claims 32, 34-37, and 39-54 appear to overcome the signal poriton of the 35 USC 101 rejection of these claims set forth at pages 3-5 of the Final Rejection.

#### Response to Arguments

3) Applicants arguments filed 11/27/2006 concerning claims 1, 3-6, 8-32, 34-37, 39-56, and 57 regarding useful, tangible, and concrete results have been fully considered, however, they are deemed not to be persuasive because "storing the established locations for the objects" does not manifest a useful and tangible result since "the established locations for the objects" are abstract entities unlike the anti-aliased pixel illumination intensity data to be displayed on a display means of In re Alappat, 31 USPQ2d 1545, 1555, 1557 (Fed. Cir. 1994) and unlike the dollar amounts of State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group Inc., 47 USPQ2d 1596, 1601 (Fed. Cir. 1998) and unlike the condition of a patient's heart of Arrhythmia Research Technology Inc. v. Corazonix Corp., 22 USPQ2d 1033 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Alappat discussed claim 15 at page 1555 and discussed their rationale at page 1557. State Street discussed the dollar amounts rationale at page 1601. Additionally at page 1599

Art Unit: 2628

State Street construed the means of the claims at elements d, e, f, and g to include storing of calculated values and this storing was not used in the analysis of the claim in determining the transformation of data, representing discrete dollar amounts, by a machine through a series of mathematical calculations into a final share price, constitutes a practical application of a mathematical algorithm, formula, or calculation, because it produces "a useful, concrete and tangible result"--a final share price momentarily fixed for recording and reporting purposes and even accepted and relied upon by regulatory authorities and in subsequent trades.

## Alappat's claim 15 discussion:

When independent claim 15 is construed in accordance with Section 112 Para. 6, claim 15 reads as follows, the subject matter in brackets representing the structure which Alappat discloses in his specification as corresponding to the respective means language recited in the claims:

A rasterizer [a "machine"] for converting vector list data representing sample magnitudes of an input waveform into anti- aliased pixel illumination intensity data to be displayed on a display means comprising:

- (a) [an arithmetic logic circuit configured to perform an absolute value function, or an equivalent thereof] for determining the vertical distance between the endpoints of each of the vectors in the data list:
- (b) [an arithmetic logic circuit configured to perform an absolute value function, or an equivalent thereof] for determining the elevation of a row of pixels that is spanned by the vector;
- (c) [a pair of barrel shifters, or equivalents thereof] for normalizing the vertical distance and elevation; and
- (d) [a read only memory (ROM) containing illumination intensity data, or an equivalent thereof] for outputting illumination intensity data as a predetermined function of the normalized vertical distance and elevation.

# Alappat's rationale discussion at page 1557:

(b) Given the foregoing, the proper inquiry in dealing with the so called mathematical subject matter exception to Section 101 alleged herein is to see whether the claimed subject matter as a whole is a disembodied mathematical concept,

Application/Control Number: 09/955,434

Art Unit: 2628

whether categorized as a mathematical formula, mathematical equation, mathematical algorithm, or the like, which in essence represents nothing more than a "law of nature," "natural phenomenon," or "abstract idea." If so, Diehr precludes the patenting of that subject matter. That is not the case here. Although many, or arguably even all, <sup>22</sup> of the means elements recited in claim 15 represent circuitry elements that perform mathematical calculations, which is essentially true of all digital electrical circuits, the claimed invention as a whole is directed to a combination of interrelated elements which combine to form a machine for converting discrete waveform data samples into anti-aliased pixel illumination intensity data to be displayed on a display means. <sup>23</sup> This is not a disembodied mathematical concept which may be characterized as an "abstract idea," but rather a specific machine to produce a useful, concrete, and tangible result.

State Street's rationale discussion at page 1601:

Today, we hold that the transformation of data, representing discrete dollar amounts, by a machine through a series of mathematical calculations into a final share price, constitutes a practical application of a mathematical algorithm, formula, or calculation, because it produces "a useful, concrete and tangible result"--a final share price momentarily fixed for recording and reporting purposes and even accepted and relied upon by regulatory authorities and in subsequent trades.

Thus, in this application amending the claims to store "the established locations for the objects" does not produce a useful, concrete, and tangible result.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffery A Brier whose telephone number is (571) 272-7656. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 7:00 to 3:30. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Razavi, can be reached at (571) 272-7664. The fax phone Number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 09/955,434 Page 5

Art Unit: 2628

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jeffry A. Brier, Jeffery A Brier Primary Examiner Division 2628